

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-22 are amended for grammatical and clarity reasons. Independent claims 1, 12 and 22 are further amended, as discussed at the personal interview, to change "appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the displayed image" to "is continuous within a tolerance value."

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Roswell in the May 2, 2008 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

**I. Information Disclosure Statement**

As discussed at the personal interview, an Information Disclosure Statement is filed herewith listing the published versions of the three previously identified copending applications. The Examiner is requested to consider the listed information and return to Applicants an initialed copy of the PTO-1449 form.

**II. The Claims Are Patentable Over The Applied Reference**

The Office Action rejects claims 1-22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,923,307 to Hogle IV (Hogle). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

As discussed above, and at the personal interview, independent claims 1, 12 and 22 are amended to change "appears substantially continuous to a viewer situated to view the displayed image" to "is continuous within a tolerance value". As tentatively agreed at the personal interview, the amended claims distinguish over the applied references.

Hogle fails to disclose all the features of the claims because (1) the Office Action is impermissibly combining two separately disclosed teachings of Hogle to "anticipate" the claims; and (2) even if the two teachings are combined, the combined teachings fail to disclose or suggest all the claimed features. Specifically, regarding independent claim 1,

Hogle fails to disclose or suggest "transforming at least one of the associated image information data such that when the image represented by the image information data is displayed on each of the display areas from the associated image information data, the resulting displayed image on the at least two display areas is continuous within a tolerance value, and the displayed resolution of the image displayed on the at least one display area is different from the displayed resolution of the image displayed on the at least one other display area". Regarding independent claim 12, Hogle fails to disclose or suggest "transforming the first image information data when the image represented by the image information data is displayed on the first and second display areas from the associated first and second image information data, the resulting displayed image on the first and second display areas is continuous within a tolerance value, and the displayed resolution of the image displayed on the first display area is different than the displayed resolution of the image displayed on the second display area". Regarding independent claim 22, Hogle fails to disclose or suggest "transforming the first image information data such that when the image represented by the image information data is displayed on each of the first and second display areas from the associated image information data the resulting displayed image on the first and second display areas is continuous within a tolerance value, and the displayed resolution of the image displayed on the first display area is different from the displayed resolution of the image displayed on the second display area".

Hogle is directed to managing monitor screen displays in a multiple monitor environment. Hogle is directed to USER, a reconfiguration method that (1) arranges the monitor spaces to form a continuous non-overlapping display space at boot time and, thereafter, anytime there is a geometry change of the monitors; and (2) after a display space change, manages windows or other display regions to "avoid end-user astonishment" (col. 10,

lines 24-35). Hogle is silent as to what USER would do if an image spans two or more monitors and the display resolution of only one monitor is changed. However, Hogle discloses that if a window A spans two monitors, initially side-by-side, and the monitors are placed one above the other, USER will force the window A to be wholly within one of the monitor spaces (Figs. 16(a)-16(c); col. 17, lines 9-26), to avoid user confusion.

In the Background section, cited by the Office Action, Hogle discloses that a window C can be displayed across two monitors (Fig. 4; col. 1, lines 62-67). Hogle is silent as to the relative display resolutions of the two monitors in Fig. 4 and is silent regarding any difference in the scaling factor applied to the portions of window C in Fig. 4.

Hogle fails to disclose the features quoted above because the Office Action has impermissibly combined separately disclosed teachings of Hogle to support an "anticipation" rejection. The Office Action cites to Fig. 4, Window C and col. 1, lines 62-67, the related discussion of Fig. 4, (Office Action, pages 2-3) as showing an image across two screens; and to col. 11, lines 48-59 as disclosing the first and second portions of a source image displayed on first and second display areas, the second portion being scaled from the source image (Office Action, page 3). However, the embodiment of Fig. 4, showing window C spanning two monitors, and the related discussion at col. 1, lines 62-67 is prior art to Hogle and is described by Hogle in the Background section. The embodiment of col. 11, lines 48-59 relates to Figs. 8(a)-8(e) of Hogle. Thus, the Office Action is combining disparate teachings without any obviousness rationale. Thus, the rejection is improper.

Even if the combination of the teachings of Hogle with the prior art discussions in the Background section of Hogle is made as proposed, the combination fails to disclose or suggest the claimed features quoted above. Hogle, in discussing Window C of Fig. 4 does not disclose or suggest that the two monitor spacers 41 and 43 have different resolutions. The

Office Action cites further to various sections of several embodiments of Hogle in the rationale of the rejection. However, in these sections, no mention is made of different monitor resolutions or any images spanning two monitors: see col. 2, lines 1-8 (Hogle is a virtual workspace that spans multiple monitors, not images that span multiple monitors); col. 3, lines 14-29; col. 11, lines 48-59. While these cited sections discuss changes in geometry and the repositioning of the virtual desktop 45 over the monitors, as discussed above, the sections do not disclose or suggest that images spread across two or more display areas are continuous within a tolerance value and wherein the image portions in different display areas have different resolutions.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection.

### **III. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Jonathan H. Backenstose  
Registration No. 47,399

JAO:JHB/rxm

Attachment:  
Information Disclosure Statement

Date: June 3, 2008

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 24-0037</p>
--